

Appl. No. 10/651,550

Amdt. Dated November 23, 2005

Reply to Office Action of August 24, 2005

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the non-final Office action mailed August 24, 2005. Reexamination and reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks is respectfully solicited.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 11, 21, 22, 23 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Adibhatla et al (U.S. Patent No 6,532,412) in view of de la Vega et al (Efficient Computation of Locally Monotonic Regression). The Examiner then stated that claims 2, 4-10, 12, 14-20, 24, 26-32, 34 and 36-42 would be allowable if rewritten in independent from, including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Accordingly, applicants have amended independent claims 1, 11, 21 and 33 to include the limitations of claims 2, 12, 24, and 34 respectively. Specifically, amended independent claim 1 now includes the limitations of original claim 2, and thus effectively corresponds to claim 2 in independent form. Likewise, amended independent claim 11 now includes the limitations of original claim 12, and thus effectively corresponds to claim 12 in independent form. Likewise, amended independent claim 21 now includes the limitations of original claim 24, and thus effectively corresponds to claim 24 in independent form. Finally, amended independent claim 33 now includes the limitations of original claim 34, and thus effectively corresponds to claim 34 in independent form.

Thus, amended independent claims 1, 11, 21 and 33 are now allowable over the cited references. Furthermore, as claims 4-10 depend from, and include all the limitations of amended independent claim 1, they are also submitted to be allowable. Furthermore, as claims 4-20 depend from, and include all the limitations of amended independent claim 11, they are also submitted to be allowable. Furthermore, as claims 22-23 and 26-32 depend from, and include all the limitations of amended independent claim 21, they are also submitted to be allowable. Finally, as claims 36-42 depend from, and include all the

Appl. No. 10/651,550

Amdt. Dated November 23, 2005

Reply to Office Action of August 24, 2005

limitations of amended independent claim 33, they are also submitted to be allowable.

Claims 3, 13, 25 and 34 have been cancelled.

In summary, and in view of the amendments herein, none of the references cited by the Examiner nor any other known prior art, either alone or in combination, disclose the unique combination of features disclosed in applicant's claims presently on file. For this reason, allowance of all of applicant's claims is respectfully solicited.

Conclusion

Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections set forth in the above-noted Office Action, and an early Notice of Allowance are requested.

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number. If for some reason Applicant has not paid a sufficient fee for this response, please consider this as authorization to charge Ingrassia, Fisher & Lorenz, Deposit Account No. 50-2091 for any fee which may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ

Dated: 23 Nov 2005

By: 

S. Jared Pitts

Reg. No. 38,579

(480) 385-5060